

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 9-12 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 2, 11 and 12 have been canceled, without prejudice. Applicant explicitly reserves the right to file a continuation application directed toward these canceled claims.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mattson (US 5,303,148). Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10, and respectfully traverses as follows.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further define the feature of the invention where the dialog manager module examines text stored in the database during periods of microprocessor inactivity to determine whether the stored text contains implicit data processing requests, where implicit processing requests are determined by examining a semantic class of the text. The dialog manager module stores these implicit processing requests to an implicit processing queue and executes implicit processing requests during periods of microprocessor inactivity. Support for this amendment is found, *inter alia*, in FIG. 3, reference numeral 302, FIG. 4, reference numerals 116 and 110, FIG. 5, reference numeral 520, and paragraphs [0052], [0059], [0063]-[0065], [0072]-[0074], [0090], [0091] and [0110] – [112] from the published application.

Implicit processing requests are determined by determining whether the stored text belongs to a particular semantic class such as name, date, time or address. Thus for example if the semantic class of the text is DATE and/or TIME the dialog manager may infer that the user may want to add an entry to a calendar. Alternatively, if the semantic class of the text is NAME or ADDRESS the dialog manager may infer that the user may want to add an entry to a contact list. Implicit commands are different from explicit commands in that explicit commands are identified from a list of reserved words whereas implicit commands are identified from the semantic class of the text. Moreover, explicit commands are immediately passed to the processor for execution, whereas the dialog manager module examines the stored text to determine the presence of implicit commands only during period of inactivity, i.e., when there are no explicit commands to process or text to store. Moreover, these implicit processing requests are queued for delayed processing during subsequent periods of inactivity.

Applicant respectfully notes that none of the cited art of record discloses of suggests the aforementioned features. For at least these reasons Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to further define the feature of the invention where the dialog manager compares decoded text received from the data input device with the table of explicit commands and assigns a match score to the decoded text. The dialog manager module ranks the match score of the decoded text and if a match score assigned to a given word of decoded text is greater than a threshold score then a user intention is judged recognized, and the dialog manager module assigns values determined from the decoded text to the at least one arguments associated with the explicit command. Support for this amendment is found, for example, in paragraphs [0104], [0105], [0117], and [0118].

Claim 10 further recites that the information storage/retrieval module stores and retrieves text to/from said database in response to explicit commands received from the dialog manager.

None of the art of record discloses or suggests the determination of an explicit request using match scores, the assignment of decoded text to arguments, and the storage and retrieval of text to/from the database using such arguments. For at least these reasons Applicant requests that the rejection as applied to amended claim 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson and Dunning (US 7,162,482).

Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 depend from Claim 1 and include all of the features of the base claim plus additional features. Applicant repeats herein the reasons provided above in traversing the rejection over Mattson. Dunning does not cure the deficiencies notes above with respect to implicit processing requests. For at least these reasons Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New claims 13-42 have been added.

Support for claim 13 is found, for example, in paragraphs [0077], [0078], [0084]-0092], [0095], [0096], and [0098].

Support for claims 15, 32 and 33 is found, for example, in paragraph [0126].

Support for claims 14, 17, 20, and 31 is found, for example, in FIG. 4 (see reference numerals 112, 114, and 122), paragraphs [0044], [0065], [0073], [0086], [0087], and [0089].

Support for claims 16, 25, 26, 41 and 42 is found, for example, in original claims 7 and 8, FIG. 3, and paragraphs [0061]-[0073].

Support for claims 18, 19, 35 and 36 is found, for example, in original claim 1, FIGs. 3 -5, and paragraphs [0042], and [0043].

Support for claims 21, 22, and 38 is found, for example, in paragraphs [0104], [0105], [0117], and [0118].

Support for claims 23, 25, 26, 39, is found, for example in original claims 5, 7, and 8.

Support for claims 24, 25, 26 is found, for example in original claims 6-8.

Support for claim 27 is found, for example, in paragraphs [0077], [0078], [0084]-0092], [0095], [0096], and [0098].

Support for claims 28-30 is found, for example, in paragraphs [0084], [0085], [0095], [0096], and [0110].

Support for claims 34 and 37 is found, for example, in FIG. 4, and paragraph {0065}.

Should the claims herein be allowable but for minor matters that could be the subject of either a further submission by Applicants or an Examiner's Amendment, Applicants would appreciate the Examiner's contacting Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 30, 2010

/Jonathan Feuchtwang/
Jonathan D. Feuchtwang
Registration No. 41,017

Customer Num 33525